

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 and 33-61 are pending in this application following entry of this amendment. Claims 1, 3, 19, 33-38, 40, 45, 51-53 and 59 have been amended. Claims 30-32 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the claim amendments and remarks included herein.

#### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0260700; hereafter ‘Wang’) in view of Courant et al. (U.S. Patent 5,522,073; hereafter ‘Courant’) in further view of Kornerup et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055666; hereafter ‘Kornerup’) (Office Action, p. 2, § 52).

#### **1. Claims 1-18 and 33-50**

Claim 1 as amended recites:

“A method for controlling model execution in a graphical modeling environment, the method comprising:

displaying a view of a graphical model with a plurality of executable time-based components, **the graphical model including at least one user-configurable graphical post component representing an event, the graphical post component specifying a condition that is satisfied during execution of said graphical model before a posting of a notice of said event occurs;**

identifying when said condition is satisfied during execution of said graphical model;  
posting said notice of an occurrence of said event in said graphical modeling environment to an event handler, said posting notifying said event handler of said occurrence of said event; and

executing at least one component from said plurality of components in response to said notifying.” (emphasis added)

Wang, Courant, and Kornerup, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1.

For example, Wang, Courant, and Kornerup do not disclose or suggest “the graphical model including at least one **user-configurable graphical post component representing an event**, the graphical post component specifying a condition that is satisfied during execution of said graphical model before a posting of a notice of said event occurs,” as recited in the amended claim 1.

The Examiner rejected the former version of claim 3, which recited the display of a post component, by citing Figure 4 et seq. and Figs. 5-27 of Wang (Office Action, p. 4, first partial paragraph). The amendment of claim 1 herein recites that a view of the graphical model includes a user-configurable graphical post component. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s reliance on Wang was misplaced for the former version of claim 3 and is also misplaced for the amended version of claim 1.

Wang discusses a Guideline Execution Engine (GLEE) for clinical practice guidelines that are used to assist healthcare practitioners with patient care decisions based on clinical circumstances. The GLEE system executes a computerized guideline encoded in a format based on a guideline representation model. The GLEE system is directed to providing a flexible guideline that allows practitioners to depart from suggested practices when they are not applicable and which imposes fewer constraints on the health care practitioners (see Wang, paragraphs 0001-0005).

Amended claim 1 recites “displaying a view of a graphical model with a plurality of executable time-based components, the graphical model including at least one user-configurable graphical post component representing an event, the graphical post component specifying a condition that is satisfied during execution of said graphical model before a posting of a notice of said event occurs.” Wang does not disclose or suggest a “**user-configurable graphical post component**” that represents an event and specifies a condition that must be satisfied **during**

**execution of the graphical model** before notice of the event can be posted. The Examiner refers to Figures 4 and Figures 5-27 in rejecting the former version of claim 3 that recited a post component (office action, page 4). However, Figure 4 merely represents a high level flow diagram of a method for executing a medical guideline that has been encoded in a format based on a guideline representation model (see paragraph 0023) while Figures 5-27 represent application of the GLEE system to a hypothetical patient case (see paragraph 0024). The GLEE system discussed in Wang discusses a state chart offering health care practitioners guidance that transitions from state to state based on external clinical data for a patient (see Figures 5-27). For example, the transition may occur based on whether a patient is eligible for a second dose of influenza vaccine (see paragraph 0046). The GLEE system is not a time-based model being executed (See also Figure 4 and discussion thereon). A condition may need to be satisfied for a transition to occur in Wang, but the condition is not being satisfied **during the execution** of a graphical model that includes time-based components. Accordingly, Wang does not disclose or suggest a graphical post component that specifies a condition that must be satisfied “**during execution** of the graphical model”.

Neither Courant nor Kornerup remedy the shortcomings of Wang with respect to the display of a graphical post component. The Examiner states that Courant teaches the posting of an event to an event handler in a graphical modeling environment (OA, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree. While Courant discusses an event server (see Figure 5 and discussion thereon); Courant does not discuss a graphical modeling environment. Therefore, Courant cannot disclose or suggest the user-configurable graphical post component recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

Similarly, the Examiner cites Kornerup as teaching “executing at least one component from said plurality of components in response to said notifying” in Figure 5 et seq (see OA, page 3, first full paragraph). This portion of Kornerup discusses execution of a timed loop based on the occurrence of an associated event (see paragraph 0135 discussing Figure 5). However, there is absolutely no indication in Kornerup that a user-configurable graphical post component is provided in a graphical model in the Kornerup system as a means for controlling the timed loop’s execution.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Wang in view of Courant in further view of Kornerup, alone or in any reasonable combination, does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Applicants respectfully requests allowance of claim 1. Furthermore, since claims 2-18 are dependent upon claim 1, the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 2-18. Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claims 2-18.

Claim 33 is a medium claim corresponding to claim 1 and Applicants submit that claim 33 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed for claim 1. Claims 34-50 are dependent upon claim 33, and Applicants therefore submit that the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 34-50. Applicants request the allowance of claims 34-50.

#### 1. Claims 19-30 and 51-61

Claim 19 as amended recites:

“A method for controlling model execution in a modeling environment, the method comprising:

displaying a view of a model with a plurality of executable components, the model including **at least one user-configurable post component representing an event, the post component specifying a condition that is satisfied during execution of the model before a posting of a notice of said event occurs;**

identifying when said condition is satisfied during the execution of said model;

posting said notice of an occurrence of said event in said modeling environment to an event handler, said posting notifying said event handler of said occurrence of said event;

interrupting execution of an executing event in response to the determination of the occurrence of said specified event; and

performing an operation in said model in response to the determination of the occurrence of the specified event.” (emphasis added)

The combination of Wang in view of Courant in further view of Kornerup fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the amended claim 19. More specifically, the cited combination of references fails to disclose or suggest “at least one user-configurable post component representing an event, the post component specifying a condition that is required to

be satisfied during execution of said model before a posting of a notice of said event occurs.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion above regarding the graphical post component in claim 1 is equally applicable to the post component in claim 19.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, since Wang, Courant and Kornerup, alone or in any reasonable combination, does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 19, Applicants request the allowance of claim 19. Furthermore, since claims 20-29 are dependent upon claim 19, the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 20-29 and Applicants request the allowance of claims 20-29.

Claim 51 is a medium claim corresponding to claim 19 and Applicants submit that claim 51 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed for claim 19. Claims 52-61 are dependent upon claim 51, and Applicants therefore submit that the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 52-61. Applicants request the allowance of claims 52-61.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-056. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: November 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By       /jsc/        
John S. Curran  
Registration No.: 50,445  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicants